

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,913	03/25/2004	Alec Brusilovsky	LUC-480/Brusilovsky 6-7-2	8063
32205 Carmen Patti L	7590 03/29/201 aw Group , LLC	EXAMINER		
ONE N. LASA 44TH FLOOR	LLE STREET	ROSE, KERRI M		
CHICAGO, IL			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2474	
				ı
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/29/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/808,913	BRUSILOVSKY ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
KERRI M. ROSE	2474		

•	Examino	Aironic	í					
	KERRI M. ROSE	2474						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 04 March 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.						
application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appl	reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this libication, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the bilication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time fods:							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth	in the final rejection, whi	chever is later. In					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Esternishment and the state of	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as					
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external file.								
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w								
AMENDMENTS 2	but prior to the data of filing a brief	ill not be entered be						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); 								
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		,						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for								
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a ∈		ated alaims						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number or finally reje	cted claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOI -324)					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		- I pilatit / III o i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i						
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	kplanation of					
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3.5-14 and 16-20</u> .								
Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,3-14 and 16-20. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to c showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement(s)</i> . (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).								
13. Other:	(
/Aung S. Moe/	/Kerri M Rose/							
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2474	Examiner, Art Unit 2474							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Tang does not disclose all the features of claim 3. Tang in combination with Michael teaches claim 3 in two different ways.

First, Tang is broader than the claimed limitation. The presence system of Tang contains state information about different devices including devices which access the PSTN and devices that access a different network, such as the Internet. In the example of Fig. 7 the system determines the most likely user presence by comparing past information of all such connections, both PSTN and other network based.

Second, Tang is used in combination with Michael. Applicant is reminded that references in a 103-type rejection cannot be considred singly, Page 4 of the previous office action inclicates that reference Michael discloses "determining by the presence server a presence state of a PSTN subscriber associated with at least one of the telephone lines [fig. 4.12] based on the call event information where the call event information defines when the telephone line is available [fig. 2.206; paragraph 34; paragraph 38 which indicates a call can be intercepted and rerouted based upon presence information and other rules.]" Claim 3 further limits the spe of determining the presence by indicating a comparison of current and previous states should be a carried out. Tang discloses such a comparison of all presence state information available to the system of Tang. Therefore the combination discloses comparing current and previous states (from Tang) in the telephone lines (from Michael).